



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/817,272	04/01/2004	Brian Maxson	705397.4010	2294
34313 7590 05/12/2009 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP IP PROSECUTION DEPARTMENT 4 PARK PLAZA SUITE 1600 IRVINE, CA 92614-2558			EXAMINER TRAN, TRANG U	
			ART UNIT 2622	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/12/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/817,272

Applicant(s)

MAXSON ET AL.

Examiner

Trang U. Tran

Art Unit

2622

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-21 and 31-43 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-30, 44 and 45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 22, 2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 22-30 and 44-45 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 22-30 and 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fendley (US Patent No. 4,686,429) in view of Kawashima et al. (US Patent No. 5,898,465).

In considering claim 22, Fendley discloses all the claimed subject matter, note 1) the claimed a screen is met by the screen 18 (Fig. 1, col. 3, line 52 to col. 4, line 61), 2) a projection unit optically coupled to the screen is met by the CRT 14 (Fig. 1, col. 3, line 52 to col. 5, line 57), 3) the claimed a plurality of beacon dots positioned about the periphery of the screen is met by the plurality of phosphor dots 24, 26 and 28 (Fig. 1, col. 3, line 52 to col. 5, line 20), and 4) the claimed a detection system optically coupled to the screen and the plurality of beacon dots is met by the quadrant detectors 44 (photodetectors) which positioned adjacent to and aligned with the lens 40 and is adapted to detect the defocused line image transmitted through the lens (Fig. 1, col. 5, line 21 to col. 8, line 44), and 5) the claimed a deflection shaping system operably coupled to the projection unit and the detection system is met by the plurality of magnetic deflection coils 38 (Fig. 1, element 38, col. 4, lines 36-39).

However, Fendley explicitly does not disclose the newly added claimed a projection unit separate from and optically coupled to the screen, wherein the projection unit is operatively connected to a projection television cabinet.

Kawashima et al teaches that Fig. 1 is a plane view of a model rear projection television set, the components of the set are housed within a cabinet 10, and they include: a CRT 12, a lens 14, a mirror 16, and a screen 18, the model set includes three CRTs and multiple lenses for each CRT, although for clarity, only a single CRT and a single lens are shown in the figure (Fig. 1, col. 1, lines 29-38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the rear projection television set as taught by Kawashima

et al into Fendley's system in order to perform convergence calibration in the rear projection video displays.

In considering claim 23, the claimed wherein the detection system includes a photocell and a lens coupled to the photocell is met by the quadrant detectors 44 (photodetectors) which positioned adjacent to and aligned with the lens 40 and is adapted to detect the defocused line image transmitted through the lens (Fig. 1, col. 5, line 21 to col. 8, line 44 of Fendley).

In considering claim 24, the combination of Fendley and Kawashima et al disclose all the limitations of the instant invention as discussed in claims 22-23 above, except for providing the claimed wherein the lens is a fish eye lens. The capability of using the lens is a fish eye lens is old and well known in the art. Therefore, the Official Notice is taken. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the old and well known using of the lens is a fish eye lens into the combination of Fendley and Kawashima et al's system since it merely amount selecting available components.

In considering claim 25, the combination of Fendley and Kawashima et al disclose all the limitations of the instant invention as discussed in claims 22-23 above, except for providing the claimed wherein the lens is an insect eye lens. The capability of using the lens is an insect eye lens is old and well known in the art. Therefore, the Official Notice is taken. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the old and well known using of the lens is an insect

eye lens into the combination of Fendley and Kawashima et al's system since it merely amount selecting available components.

In considering claim 26, the claimed wherein the detection system comprises an optical element and a detector element comprising an array of photodetectors, the optical element being adapted to map a plurality of regions of measurement (ROMs) onto the detector element is met by the quadrant detectors 44 (photodetectors) which positioned adjacent to and aligned with the lens 40 and is adapted to detect the defocused line image transmitted through the lens and microcomputer's ROM and RAM (Fig. 1, col. 5, line 21 to col. 10, line 60 of Fendley).

In considering claim 27, the combination of Fendley and Kawashima et al disclose all the limitations of the instant invention as discussed in claims 22 and 26 above, except for providing the claimed wherein the optical element comprises an array of lenses. The capability of using the optical element comprises an array of lenses is old and well known in the art. Therefore, the Official Notice is taken. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the old and well known using of the optical element comprises an array of lenses into the combination of Fendley and Kawashima et al's system since it merely amount selecting available components.

In considering claim 28, the combination of Fendley and Kawashima et al disclose all the limitations of the instant invention as discussed in claims 22, 26 and 27 above, except for providing the claimed wherein the lenses are convex and hexagonal. The capability of using the lenses are convex and hexagonal is old and well known in

the art. Therefore, the Official Notice is taken. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the old and well known using of the lenses are convex and hexagonal into the combination of Fendley and Kawashima et al's system since it merely amount selecting available components.

In considering claim 29, the combination of Fendley and Kawashima et al disclose all the limitations of the instant invention as discussed in claims 22, 26 and 27 above, except for providing the claimed wherein the lenses are Fresnel lenses. The capability of using the lenses are Fresnel lenses is old and well known in the art. Therefore, the Official Notice is taken. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the old and well known using of the lenses are Fresnel lenses into the combination of Fendley and Kawashima et al's system since it merely amount selecting available components.

In considering claim 30, the combination of Fendley and Kawashima et al disclose all the limitations of the instant invention as discussed in claims 22 and 26 above, except for providing the claimed wherein the optical element comprises a hologram. The capability of using the optical element comprises a hologram is old and well known in the art. Therefore, the Official Notice is taken. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the old and well known using of the optical element comprises a hologram into the combination of Fendley and Kawashima et al's system since it merely amount selecting available components.

In considering claim 44, the claimed wherein the deflection shaping system further comprises deflection shaping circuitry used to maneuver a CRT beam is met by the plurality of magnetic deflection coils 38 of Fendley (Fig. 1, element 38, col. 4, lines 36-39).

In considering claim 45, the claimed wherein the deflection shaping system further comprises at least one positioning device operatively connected to said projection unit is met by the plurality of magnetic deflection coils 38 of Fendley (Fig. 1, element 38, col. 4, lines 36-39).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trang U. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-7358. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM - 6:30 PM, Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lin Ye can be reached on (571) 272-7372. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

May 10, 2009

/Trang U. Tran/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2622